

BEEF TRUST ESCAPES

Moody Is After Individuals Rather Than Corporations.

NOW ON TRAIL OF STANDARD

Further Prosecution of Packing Combine Would Interfere with Campaign Against Oil Monopoly. Judge Humphrey's Immunity Bath the Most Disheartening Blow of All.

Attorney General Moody does not intend, at present, at least, to prosecute the cases pending in Chicago against the beef trust violations of the anti-trust law. Although indictments were voted against all the big corporations doing business at the stock yards last year, nothing is being done by the Department of Justice to get a trial, and the indications are that no further efforts in that direction will be made in the near future, if at all.

These indictments were voted at the same time true bills were returned against the packers individually. The trial of the cases against both the packing corporations and the packers personally, for which the government was making great preparations, was suddenly blocked by the famous immunity plea set up by the astute lawyers for the defense.

Given an Immunity Bath. The outcome of this move, it will be remembered, was the decision by Judge Humphrey, granting the defendants, as individuals, an immunity bath. It was this decision which caused the President to send a special message to Congress, criticizing the judge.

The prosecution has since recovered from the blow, in fact, it so disheartened Attorney General Moody and his assistants, including Special Attorney Oliver K. Pagn, who drew up the indictments, and District Attorney Morrison, who had personal charge of the cases, that they felt it was not worth their while to seek conviction of the corporations.

Their feelings are best summed up in the expression: "What's the use?" The only thing to be gained by following up the matter, even if a favorable verdict is returned, is a fine against the defendant companies.

Defendants Would Appeal. Such a decision would be followed by an appeal on the part of the defendants; the case would ultimately land in the Supreme Court, and it would take months, and possibly years, of litigation and endless effort to carry the matter through to a victorious ending. The packers have an army of the ablest lawyers in the country back of them, and every device and tactic for delaying a final decision will be resorted to.

All this time the other big cases the Department of Justice has on its hands—especially the prosecution of the Standard Oil Company—would suffer. Indictments numbering over 2,000 have already been voted in Chicago against the Standard Oil Trust. These will be coming to trial before long. Other prosecutions of even greater magnitude are being prepared against the same monopoly, and will be sprung in a few weeks.

Mr. Morrison, who handled the beef cases for the government, has been succeeded by E. W. Sims, as district attorney, and is now one of the special attorneys handling the Standard Oil inquiry. So to attempt to carry the beef cases to trial would mean the hampering of the oil investigation, which is regarded as of far more importance.

Not Enough to Be Gained. This, in brief, is the attitude taken by the Administration. It is not believed there is enough to be gained, and there is too much to be lost by dividing the government's fire between beef trust and oil trust.

It is not without some regret, however, that the prosecution of the packers is relinquished. That was the first big gun fired in the government campaign against monopolies. No effort was spared in the preparatory work. Several months were consumed in getting the evidence into shape for submission to the grand jury. The selection of that body was carried on with the utmost care. Each victim was subjected to a rigid examination, and secret agents investigated their business

WEATHER CONDITIONS.

U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Weather Bureau. Washington, D. C., Saturday, Oct. 13-3 p. m. The eastern area of high pressure has increased considerably in strength during the last twenty-four hours, and now controls the weather conditions east of the Mississippi. The western disturbance is apparently filling in, although the southern end of it has caused considerable rain in Eastern Texas and New Mexico; elsewhere the weather has been fair. Low temperatures continue in northern districts and the Northwest. In the latter section and the Upper Lake region the temperature is 8 to 10 degrees below the seasonal average. Fair weather is indicated for Sunday and Monday, except in the West Gulf States, and thence southward into Nebraska, where rain is probable. Late in the afternoon in the Middle and Southern Rocky Mountain region and the Southern Florida coast. The temperature will rise to eastern districts, and will be cooler in the Missouri valley, Nebraska, Kansas, Missouri, Oklahoma, Indian Territory, and the Southern States. The winds along the New England coast will be light and variable; on the Middle Atlantic coast light to fresh northwesterly; on the South Atlantic and East Gulf coasts fresh northwesterly; on the West Gulf coast fresh, possibly brisk easterly, and on the Great Lakes coast fresh to strong easterly. SPECIAL FORECAST. Storm warnings are displayed on the Washington and Oregon coasts.

Local Temperature. Midnight, 51; 2 a. m., 52; 4 a. m., 53; 6 a. m., 54; 8 a. m., 55; 10 a. m., 56; 12 noon, 57; 2 p. m., 58; 4 p. m., 59; 6 p. m., 60; 8 p. m., 61; 10 p. m., 62; Maximum, 63; minimum, 51. Relative humidity, 75; wind, 5; 2 p. m., 23; 8 p. m., 77; Rainfall, 0. Hours of sunshine, 11.5. Percent of possible sunshine, 100. Temperature same date last year—Maximum, 62; minimum, 50.

Temperature of Other Cities.

Temperatures in other cities, together with the rainfall for the twelve hours ended at 9 p. m. yesterday, are as follows:

City	Max.	Min.	P. m. fall.
Asheville, N. C.	52	40	56
Atlanta, Ga.	52	40	56
Baltimore, Md.	52	40	56
Boston, Mass.	52	40	56
Buffalo, N. Y.	52	40	56
Chicago, Ill.	52	40	56
Cincinnati, Ohio	52	40	56
Cleveland, Ohio	52	40	56
Dayton, Ohio	52	40	56
Des Moines, Iowa	52	40	56
Evansville, Ind.	52	40	56
Indianapolis, Ind.	52	40	56
Kansas City, Mo.	52	40	56
Little Rock, Ark.	52	40	56
Memphis, Tenn.	52	40	56
New Orleans, La.	52	40	56
New York, N. Y.	52	40	56
North Platte, Neb.	52	40	56
Omaha, Neb.	52	40	56
Philadelphia, Pa.	52	40	56
Salt Lake City, Utah	52	40	56
St. Louis, Mo.	52	40	56
St. Paul, Minn.	52	40	56
Springfield, Ill.	52	40	56
Vicksburg, Miss.	52	40	56

Tide Table.

High tide to-day—4:54 a. m. and 5:06 p. m. Low tide to-day—11:23 a. m. and 11:46 p. m. High tide to-morrow—5:30 a. m. and 5:37 p. m. Low tide to-morrow—12:10 a. m. and 1:00 p. m.

Condition of Water at Harpers Ferry.

Harpers Ferry, W. Va., Oct. 13.—Both the Shenandoah and Potomac rivers are clear.

FIGHT FOR AN ESTATE

Petition for Preservation of Colton Property.

SEQUESTRATION IS CHARGED

Attorneys for the Grandchild Also Seek to Have Question of Domicile at Time of Death Settled—Want New Letters of Administration Granted—History of the Case.

Another, and a most important move was made in the case of the Colton will contest yesterday, when R. Golden Donahue and R. W. Parker, attorneys on behalf of Helen Marguerite Beatrice Sacher, the six-year-old great-granddaughter of the late Ellen M. Colton, daughter of Gen. R. D. Colton, filed a petition in the Probate Court of the District, praying that collectors be appointed to collect and preserve for the estate all of the property left by Mrs. Ellen M. Colton.

The petition further asks the court that William J. Barnett be required to appear and answer under oath with respect to bonds in this and other estates he took from the American Security and Trust Company after Mrs. Colton's death, and what stocks were sent to him in New York, and turn over such property to the collector of the estate.

It is further petitioned that the issue be framed to try before the court the question of Mrs. Colton's domicile at the time of her death, and also that letters of administration upon the estate be issued to some suitable person or persons.

Claims in Petition. It is stated in the petition that Mrs. Colton died at her residence, 107 Connecticut avenue, February 19, 1905, where she had resided for ten years before her death, and that at her death she left an estate consisting of real estate and stocks and bonds valued at about \$50,000.

Had Two Children. It appears from the petition that Ellen M. Colton had two children, Helen Colton and Caroline Colton. Helen married Crittenden Thornton, and died in Paris in October, 1890, leaving one child, Helen Colton Thornton. This daughter married Siegfried Sacher in Paris. She died in February, 1904, leaving an only child, the contestant, Helen Marguerite Beatrice Sacher.

The other daughter of Mrs. Colton, Caroline Colton, married Daniel Cook, and after his death, married Henry M. Martin, which name this daughter bore when Mrs. Colton died. After the death of Mrs. Colton, Mrs. Martin married John R. Dahlgren. It is further stated in the petition that Mrs. Colton's estate was located in the District of Columbia, the bonds being in a safe deposit box in the American Security and Trust Company, and that the only property she owned elsewhere was a small cottage at Santa Cruz, Cal., valued at \$3,000.

Came Here Eight Years Ago. Mrs. Martin and her family came to Washington to live with Mrs. Colton about seven, or eight years before her death, and during the summer months Mrs. Martin returned to California, and Mrs. Colton went to Paris to visit her great-granddaughter, for whom the deceased had been entertaining an unusually strong affection, expressing her deep love and affection for her great-granddaughter in letters and otherwise, and during her last visit to her great-granddaughter in 1904, she wanted to adopt her.

Stricken in 1904. Shortly after Mrs. Colton's return to Washington from her last visit to her great-granddaughter in Paris in 1904, she was stricken with a combination of diseases from which she had previously suffered, growing rapidly worse, and finally dying on February 19, 1905.

The petition states that while Mrs. Colton was desperately ill, and when she was very feeble in mind and body, and unable to know and realize what her property consisted of, and who were the contestants of her home, Mrs. Martin, Mrs. Dahlgren, and Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

Was Resident of District. It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

FIGHT FOR AN ESTATE

Petition for Preservation of Colton Property.

SEQUESTRATION IS CHARGED

Attorneys for the Grandchild Also Seek to Have Question of Domicile at Time of Death Settled—Want New Letters of Administration Granted—History of the Case.

Another, and a most important move was made in the case of the Colton will contest yesterday, when R. Golden Donahue and R. W. Parker, attorneys on behalf of Helen Marguerite Beatrice Sacher, the six-year-old great-granddaughter of the late Ellen M. Colton, daughter of Gen. R. D. Colton, filed a petition in the Probate Court of the District, praying that collectors be appointed to collect and preserve for the estate all of the property left by Mrs. Ellen M. Colton.

The petition further asks the court that William J. Barnett be required to appear and answer under oath with respect to bonds in this and other estates he took from the American Security and Trust Company after Mrs. Colton's death, and what stocks were sent to him in New York, and turn over such property to the collector of the estate.

It is further petitioned that the issue be framed to try before the court the question of Mrs. Colton's domicile at the time of her death, and also that letters of administration upon the estate be issued to some suitable person or persons.

Claims in Petition. It is stated in the petition that Mrs. Colton died at her residence, 107 Connecticut avenue, February 19, 1905, where she had resided for ten years before her death, and that at her death she left an estate consisting of real estate and stocks and bonds valued at about \$50,000.

Had Two Children. It appears from the petition that Ellen M. Colton had two children, Helen Colton and Caroline Colton. Helen married Crittenden Thornton, and died in Paris in October, 1890, leaving one child, Helen Colton Thornton. This daughter married Siegfried Sacher in Paris. She died in February, 1904, leaving an only child, the contestant, Helen Marguerite Beatrice Sacher.

The other daughter of Mrs. Colton, Caroline Colton, married Daniel Cook, and after his death, married Henry M. Martin, which name this daughter bore when Mrs. Colton died. After the death of Mrs. Colton, Mrs. Martin married John R. Dahlgren. It is further stated in the petition that Mrs. Colton's estate was located in the District of Columbia, the bonds being in a safe deposit box in the American Security and Trust Company, and that the only property she owned elsewhere was a small cottage at Santa Cruz, Cal., valued at \$3,000.

Came Here Eight Years Ago. Mrs. Martin and her family came to Washington to live with Mrs. Colton about seven, or eight years before her death, and during the summer months Mrs. Martin returned to California, and Mrs. Colton went to Paris to visit her great-granddaughter, for whom the deceased had been entertaining an unusually strong affection, expressing her deep love and affection for her great-granddaughter in letters and otherwise, and during her last visit to her great-granddaughter in 1904, she wanted to adopt her.

Stricken in 1904. Shortly after Mrs. Colton's return to Washington from her last visit to her great-granddaughter in Paris in 1904, she was stricken with a combination of diseases from which she had previously suffered, growing rapidly worse, and finally dying on February 19, 1905.

The petition states that while Mrs. Colton was desperately ill, and when she was very feeble in mind and body, and unable to know and realize what her property consisted of, and who were the contestants of her home, Mrs. Martin, Mrs. Dahlgren, and Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

Was Resident of District. It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett, and that in it he was named as sole executor, and that by this paper, all of Mrs. Colton's estate was to go to Mrs. Martin and her family, disinheriting her great-granddaughter.

It is also stated that, inasmuch as Mrs. Colton was an actual bona fide resident of the District of Columbia at the time of her death and continuously for ten years prior, and all of her estate was located here, the Probate Court of this district has exclusive jurisdiction to administer the estate.

Charges Made. The claim is advanced that, pursuant to the preconceived plan of Walter J. Barnett and Caroline Martin to secure for themselves and Mrs. Martin's family all of the Colton estate, Walter J. Barnett coerced and unlawfully required Mrs. Colton to sign a paper, which these persons now claim is Mrs. Colton's will, which Mrs. Colton herself, however, denied afterward. It is stated that this paper was prepared in the handwriting of Walter J. Barnett,